

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 21, 29, and 33 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 21-40 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 23 and 24

In Section 1 of the Office Action, Claims 23 and 24 are objected to under 37 CRF 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 23 recites “registering the passenger for the travel based on the received travel information.” This limitation further limits the recited limitations of Claim 21. Referring generally to the limitations of Claim 21, a baggage transportation service can be provided, travel information can be received, baggage identification can be produced, and baggage can be transported without registering a passenger for travel. Claim 24 further limits Claim 23. It is possible to register for travel without providing or obtaining a boarding pass. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21, 29 and 33

In Section 3 of the Office Action, Claims 21, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. The Examiner argues that “it is not distinct what is the range of the ‘written operations’ Applicant is referring.” Applicant has amended Claims 21, 29, and 33 to overcome this rejection. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 35-40

In Section 5 of the Office Action, Claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,512,964 (Quackenbush et al.). Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant continues to reserve the right to swear behind Quackenbush et al.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states: “Quackenbush ‘964 column 8, lines 58-62, indicates that the GDO Service could be provided from any establishment.” However, Quackenbush et al. does not have a column 8 and a review of lines 58-62 of all other columns in Quackenbush et al. shows no support for this statement by the Examiner.

Quackenbush et al. describes its process as follows: “Baggage 202 is picked up by a Ground Delivery Operator (GDO) from origin location 204. The baggage may be checked by the GDO at the origin location 204, or transported and checked on behalf of its owner at origin airport 206. In a preferred embodiment, the GDOs act as agents on behalf of the airline.” (Col. 3, lines 13-18.) Nowhere does Quackenbush et al. describe or suggest the baggage transportation service being an integrated service at a remote property where the integrated service is performed as one of a plurality of remote property functions, as required by independent Claims 21, 29, and 33. Moreover, Quackenbush et al. states that preferably, the GDO’s act as agents of the airline.

(See Col. 3, lines 17-18.) There is no suggestion in Quackenbush et al. that employees of the remote property work in the position of what it calls GDO's.

Applicant's claimed invention overcomes one of the weakness of Quackenbush et al. In the present application, the Applicant teaches:

[0008] The Quackenbush patent fails to provide important teachings that may ultimately determine the viability of the service when implemented, if ever. The Quackenbush patent indicates that a Ground Delivery Operator (GDO) picks up baggage from an origin location and takes it to an origin airport. However, there is no teaching of how customers check in baggage. It is not clear if the passenger has to wait for a GDO to travel to where the customer is or, if a GDO is located at the remote property, how staffing issues are addressed. Indeed, there is nothing in the Quackenbush patent that helps solve the staffing problems faced by known remote baggage processing systems, such as the CAPS service.

(Present application, [0008], emphasis added.)

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be properly maintained where the reference does not disclose, suggest, or teach each and every limitation of the rejected claims.

Quackenbush et al. does not disclose, suggest, or teach every limitation of Claims 21-40. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to the claims.

Claims 22, 31 and 34

In Section 6 of the Office Action, Claims 22, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quackenbush et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,793,639 (Yamazaki) and U.S. Patent 4,984,156 (Mekata). Applicant traverses the rejection. For the reasons stated above, Quackenbush et al. fails to disclose, suggest, or teach every limitation of the rejected claims. Yamazaki and Mekata do not provide the missing teachings. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 7


In Section 7 of the Office Action, Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quackenbush et al., as shown by Yamazaki and Mekata. Applicant traverses the rejection. For the reasons stated above, Quackenbush et al. fails to disclose, suggest, or teach every limitation of the rejected claims. Yamazaki and Mekata do not provide the missing teachings. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2350. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-2350. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2350.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Date September 22, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23524
Telephone: (608) 258-4292
Facsimile: (608) 258-4258

Paul S. Hunter
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,787